

**Remarks:**

These remarks are responsive to the Office action dated November 1, 2005. As of the filing of this Response, claims 1, 3-17, 19 and 21-25 remain pending in the application. Nevertheless, the Examiner rejects claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Weber et al. (US 6,480,901). Claims 19 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Lortz (US 6,505,243). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Although the November 1, 2005 Office action indicated that the action was final, applicants note the Examiner subsequently indicated (in a January 12, 2005 telephone interview with Walter W. Karnstein) that the indication of finality was erroneous, and that applicants thus should treat the November 1, 2005 Office action as a non-final Office action.

In view of the remarks below, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and allowance of the pending claims.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Weber et al. (US 6,480,901)**

As noted above, claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Weber et al. However, inasmuch as only claims 1, 3-17, 19 and 21-25 remain pending, applicants understand the rejection to refer only to claims 1, 3-17, 19 and 21-25.

**Claims 1 and 3-17**

Claim 1 recites a device management system including, in part, "a server configured to execute a management application", "a device configured to announce its presence to the management application," and "at least one agent/codelet pair

Page 7 - RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION  
Serial No. 09/875,331  
HP Docket No. 10007050-1  
KH Docket No. HPCB 315

including an agent and a codelet, wherein the device is configured to execute the codelet and the management application is configured to execute the agent, and the agent and codelet are configured to communicate with each other via the network to achieve a predetermined function." Claims 3-17 depend from claim 1.

Weber et al. discloses to a system that manages devices (504, 506) on a network (502) from a management station (510) via a proxy server (508). Weber et al. does not disclose or suggest a device configured to announce its presence to the management station, and does not disclose or suggest an agent/codelet pair wherein an I/O device is configured to execute the codelet, and an application on the management station is configured to execute the agent such that the agent and codelet communicate via the network to accomplish a predetermined function.

As noted, claim 1 recites a device "configured to announce its presence to the management application." The Examiner indicates that, in Weber et al., the management interface application program (518) is analogous to the recited management application, and that the I/O device (506) is analogous to the recited device. However, Weber et al. specifies (at col. 9, lines 11-42) that I/O device (506) is discovered by management station (510). There is no mention of the I/O device announcing its presence to the management application. For at least this reason, claim 1 is not anticipated by Weber et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and the rejection of claim 1 must be withdrawn.

Furthermore, according to the Examiner, RPC conversion agent (522) and UTM-to-internal-messaging component (536) serve as agent/codelet pair in Weber et al. However, as indicated in Fig. 5 of Weber et al., RPC conversion agent (522) is executed by proxy server (508). Weber et al. thus does not disclose or suggest an

Page 8 - RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION  
Serial No. 09/875,331  
HP Docket No. 10007050-1  
KH Docket No. HPCB 315

agent of the agent/codelet pair that is executed by a management application (management interface application program (518), according to the Examiner). Moreover, the RPC conversion agent (522) and the UTM-to-internal-messaging component (536) (collectively the agent and codelet, according to the Examiner) do not communicate with each other via the network (network 502, according to the Examiner). Claim 1 thus is not anticipated by Weber et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for at least these additional reasons. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Weber et al. and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Weber et al. must be withdrawn.

Claims 3-17 depend from claim 1, and thus are distinguished from Weber et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3-17 are allowable over Weber et al. and the rejection of claims 3-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Weber et al. must be withdrawn.

#### **Claims 21-24**

Claim 21 recites a method for managing one or more devices connected to a computer network including, in part, "preconfiguring a device with an agent/codelet pair" and "In response to connection of the device to the network, sending a message from an embedded server on the device to a management application on a management server via a well-known address, thereby announcing the presence of the device on the network." Claims 22-24 depend from claim 21.

Contrary to the Examiner's characterization, applicants assert that Weber et al. does not disclose or suggest "sending a message from an embedded server on the device to a management application on a management server via a well-known address, thereby announcing the presence of the device on the network" as recited

Page 9 - RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION  
Serial No. 09/875,331  
HP Docket No. 10007050-1  
KH Docket No. HPCB 315

In claim 21. As noted above, Weber et al. discloses nothing more than that I/O device (506) is discovered by management station (510). See, col. 9, lines 11-42. Weber et al. thus fails to anticipate claim 21 and the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Weber et al. must be withdrawn.

Inasmuch as claims 22-24 depend from claim 21, such claims are distinguished from Weber et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 21. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Weber et al. also must be withdrawn.

#### **Claims 19 and 25**

Claim 19 recites a device management system for use with a computer network including, in part, "a management server configured to execute a management application" and "a device configured to connect to the network and communicate with the management application, the device including an embedded server and at least one agent/codelet pair having an agent and a codelet, wherein the embedded server is configured to automatically upload the agent to the management application of the management server, wherein the management application is configured to install the agent at the management server; and wherein, after installation of the agent at the management server, the agent and the codelet are configured to communicate with each other to achieve a predetermined functionality."

Weber et al. does not disclose or suggest device including an embedded server and at least one agent/codelet pair having an agent and a codelet, wherein the embedded server is configured to automatically upload the agent to the management application of the management server, wherein the management

Page 10 - RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION  
Serial No. 09/875,331  
HP Docket No. 10007050-1  
KH Docket No. HPCB 315

application is configured to install the agent at the management server; and wherein, after installation of the agent at the management server, the agent and the codelet are configured to communicate with each other to achieve a predetermined functionality.

According to the Examiner's interpretation of Weber et al, the agent (RPC conversion agent (522)) resides on proxy server (508). There is no indication that any embedded server on the device (I/O device (506), according to the Examiner) is configured to "automatically upload the agent to the management application (management interface application program (518), according to the Examiner). Correspondingly, there is no indication in Weber et al. that the management application is configured to install the agent at the management server (management station (510), according to the Examiner). For at least the foregoing reasons, the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Weber et al. also must be withdrawn.

Claim 25 recites a method for managing devices on a computer network that includes "sending the agent from the device to the management server connected to the network", and "installing the agent at the management server".

As noted generally above with respect to claim 19, Weber et al. does not disclose or suggest sending the agent to the management application (management interface application program (518), according to the Examiner), and does not disclose or suggest installing the agent at the management server (management station (510), according to the Examiner). For at least the foregoing reasons, the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Weber et al. also must be withdrawn.

Page 11 - RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION  
Serial No. 09/875,331  
HP Docket No. 10007050-1  
KH Docket No. HPCB 315

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Lortz et al. (US 6,505,243)**

Claims 19 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Lortz et al. (US 6,505,243). Lortz discloses automatic web-based detection and display of product installation and help information. As the applicants indicated in their August 16, 2005 Amendment, Lortz fails to disclose or suggest the specific limitations of the agent/codelet pair recited by claims 19 and 25.

**Claims 19 and 25**


Lortz teaches a configuring device retrieving "Installation, configuration and customization data for the device." See, column 5, lines 20-21. The Examiner asserts that the installation data of Lortz anticipates the agent/codelet pair of the present application. However, Lortz further teaches, "[i]n installation data typically includes how to further connect the device to other devices....," and "[i]n installation data is formatted according in [sic] an interface language ... that describes required installation and configuration options for the device." See, column 5, lines 22-23, 48-51) Accordingly, the applicant asserts that the installation data taught by Lortz is merely *passive* information exchanged between the configuring device and the device, in sharp contrast with the agent and codelet pair of the present application, which *actively* "communicate with each other to achieve a predetermined functionality." Claims 19 and 25, therefore, are allowable, and applicants request the withdrawal of the rejection of these claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Lortz.

**Conclusion**

Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance in view of the above remarks. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability covering the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please contact the undersigned attorney of record.

Respectfully submitted,


KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.



Walter W. Kamstein  
Registration No. 35,565  
520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 200  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 224-6655  
Facsimile: (503) 295-6679  
Attorney for Applicants

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Examiner M. Delgado, Group Art Unit 2144, Commissioner for Patents, at facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on February 1, 2006.



Christie A. Doolittle

Page 13 - RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION  
Serial No. 09/875,331  
HP Docket No. 10007050-1  
KH Docket No. HPCB 315